David Lochabay	
Asst. Attorney General OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	
2nd Fl., Juan A. Sablan Admin. Bldg.	
Capital Hill Caller Box 10007 CHRB	
Saipan MP, 96950	
Cel: 664-2341 Cax: 664-2349	원들은 다른 항공을 가능한 경기를 받
E-mail: lochabay@gmail.com	
Attorneys for Jonas Barcinas	
	ATES DISTRICT COURT
FO	R THE
NORTHERN M	ARIANA ISLANDS
HOMAYAN KABIR,	) No. CV 07 0034
Plaintiff,	
1 mm.,	
	) MOTION TO DISMISS ) OF DEFENDANT JONAS BARCINAS
CNMI PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, and	
ONAS BARCINAS	) Hearing Date:
Defendants.	) Judge: Munson
COMES NOW Defendant Jonas Barcina	as, who would now present to the Court this Motion to
Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint in the above style	d and numbered cause.
As grounds for the Motion, Movant would	ld show the Court the following:
	가는 사람들이 되는 것이 되었다. 그 사람들이 되는 것이 되었다. 그는 것은 것이다. 보는 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그 사람들이 가득하는 것이 되었다. 그 사람들이 되었다.
I. ST	ANDARD
In considering a motion to dismiss, the C	ourt must regard plaintiff's well-pleaded facts as true
and admitted. Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 23	2, 94 S.Ct. 1963 (1974). The Court may also draw
easonable inferences from the facts pleaded, all	though the Court is not required to strain to find such
inferences. id. While the court generally must as	sume factual allegations to be true, it need not assume
he truth of legal conclusions cast in the form of	f factual allegations. United States ex rel. Chunie v
Ringrose, 788 F.2d 638, 643 (9th Cir. 1986), cer.	t. den. 479 U.S. 1009, 107 S.Ct. 650, 93 L.Ed.2d 705
Dismissal is proper where the complaint lacks a c	ognizable legal theory or where the complaint present
a cognizable legal theory yet fails to plead essent	tial facts under that theory. Robertson v. Dean Witte
Reynolds, Inc., 749 F.2d 530, 534 (9th Cir. 1984	

#### 

### 

# 

## 

### 

## 

#### 

## 

#### 

#### 

### 

#### 

#### 

## 

### 

#### 

## 

## 

#### 

#### II. ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES

#### A. Supervisors and co-workers may not be sued under Title VII

Plaintiff's First Cause of Action states a claim for unlawful employment practices under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq*. This cause of action is pleaded against all defendants. Complaint, ¶¶ 13-16.

The Ninth Circuit does not recognize a separate cause of action against supervisors or co-workers under Title VII. *Craig v. M&O Agencies, Inc.*, 496 F.3d 1047, 1058 (CA9 2007) ("We have long held that Title VII does not provide a separate cause of action against supervisors or co-workers.") *See also Holly D. v. Cal. Inst. of Tech.*, 339 F.3d 1158, 1179 (CA9 2003); *Pink v. Modoc Indian Health Project, Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1185, 1189 (CA9 1998); *Miller v. Maxwell's Int'l, Inc.*, 991 F.2d 583, 587-88 (CA9 1993).

Under the above authorities, Plaintiff's First Cause of Action, as pleaded against Defendant Barcinas, must be dismissed.

#### B. Plaintiff's Fourth Cause of Action should be Dismissed.

In his Fourth Cause of Action, Plaintiff pleads the common law tort of assault and battery against Defendant Barcinas. Complaint, ¶ 22. This state law claim is pleaded pursuant to the Court's supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. If jurisdiction is exercised, Federal courts apply the substantive law of the state in which they sit to adjudicate such claims. *Bird v. Lewis & Clark College*, 303 F.3d 1015, 1023, (CA9, Or., 2002).

Defendant Barcinas has filed a contemporaneous Motion to have the CNMI substituted as the defendant for the Fourth Cause of Action. Defendant Barcinas incorporates and adopts the Motion to Substitute CNMI as Defendant as to Plaintiff's Fourth Cause of Action, and the Memorandum in Support of said Motion, as if completely set forth herein.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendant Barcinas prays that, upon hearing, the Court enter its Order dismissing the above two causes of action as to Defendant Barcinas, and for such

	Case 1:07-cv-00034	
1	other and further relief as the Court may deem just and equitable.	
2	Respectfully submitted,	
3		
4		
5	Asst. Attorney General	
6	Asst. Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Attorneys for Defendant Barcinas	
7	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
8		
9	I hereby certify that the above and foregoing has been e-filed this 31st day of January, 2008, with service requested to Joseph E. Horey, O'Connor Berman Dotts & Banes, attorneys for Plaintiff.	
10	/s/ David Lochabay	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
.17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		